2016 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Final Report to the CRC
Protection of the Rural Boundary Work Group

Work Group Members: Doug Gondera, Chair
Pat DiVecchio
Cheryl Moore

During the CRC meeting held on November 12, 2015, the 2016 CRC created the Protection of the Rural Boundary Work Group to study a proposal for protection of the rural areas of the county.

At that same time, at the request of Chair Hawkins, the CRC reassigned the topic of the Urban Focus Amendment to this Work Group.

Based on its study, the Protection of the Rural Boundary Work Group recommends no changes to the Charter.

The Work Group also recommends transmitting a recommendation to the Mayor that she explore designating a staff member to serve a Coordinator for Pine Hills as discussed in the Urban Neighborhood Focus Amendment proposal.

Overview of the Work Group Process

Over the past 3 months, the Protection of the Rural Boundary Work Group held 4 meetings, averaging 1.5 hours per meeting. The Work Group considered extensive public input provided during Work Group and CRC meetings. One of the first topics considered by Work Group members was the Urban Neighborhood Focus Amendment. In the course of consideration, the Work Group received information concerning the Pine Hills (NID) Neighborhood Improvement District. The emphasis of the Pine Hills NID is to bring business, citizens and government together to solve the challenges of the community. The Pine Hills NID was established in December 2011. It is managed by its Board of Directors, the Board of County Commissioners. The NID is comprised of an Advisory Council consisting of Pine Hills property owners. Lastly, the NID uses County staff from the Neighborhood Preservation & Revitalization Division.

County staff Lavon Williams, Manager of Neighborhood Preservation and Revitalization Division, and Michele Owens, Executive Director of the Pine Hills Neighborhood Improvement District presented on related matters. It was noted that neither Ms. Williams nor Ms. Owens is empowered to directly coordinate with county department heads on behalf of Pine Hills. Following staff's presentation, the Work Group moved that the Urban Neighborhood Focus Amendment will receive no further consideration as a charter amendment, and that a recommendation be made to transmit to a recommendation to the Mayor that she explore designating a staff member to serve as a Coordinator for Pine Hills, empowered to directly coordinate with county department heads on behalf of Pine Hills. Work Group members believe that the Charter is not an appropriate mechanism to address these issues raised by the public.

The Work Group also studied issues regarding protection of the rural boundary areas, specifically changes to Section 207 of the Charter. Based upon requested changes submitted through Save Orange County, a Citizens Community Group, Work Group members requested that Attorney Vose review the Sarasota Charter Amendment presented as a model for the protection of the rural boundary area issue.

Attorney Vose reported that Sarasota County is the only Charter County in the State of Florida which requires a unanimous County Commission vote for Comprehensive Policy Plan amendments outside of the Urban Service Area (USA) or which expand the existing USA. Work Group members reviewed materials relating to Sarasota County ordinances.

County staff Greg Golgowski, AICP, Chief Planner, and Susan McCune, AICP, Project Manager, Planning Division, presented on the County's Comprehensive Plan. The Orange County Plan was adopted in 1991; amendments are allowed to address changing conditions. Staff noted that Florida Statutes require that the Future Land Use Element and any amendment to the Future Land Use Element discourage the proliferation of urban sprawl. An amendment is deemed to discourage the proliferation of sprawl if it incorporates a development pattern or urban form that achieves 4 or more of 8 indicators. [Exhibit A]

The Orange County Plan includes an USA established to direct growth into the areas supported by central utilities. Expanding the USA must include data demonstrating that efficient provision of infrastructure, protection of the environment, and land use compatibility can be accomplished.

Staff presented on the County Comprehensive Policy Plan amendment process including community meetings, Local Planning Agency (LPA) hearings, and BCC hearings.

Finally, the Work Group heard extensive testimony and conflicting views on the issue. [Exhibit B]

The Work Group directed CRC staff to compile data relative to Comprehensive Policy Plan Amendments (CPPA) both at Transmittal and Adoption public hearings. This data reflects voting results during BCC public hearings. The data only reflects Comprehensive Policy Plan Amendments brought to a vote before the BCC and does not reflect CPPA's pulled by the applicant prior to a vote by the BCC. [Exhibit C]

Based upon the factors considered, the Work Group has made the following recommendations.

Recommendations

- Make no changes to Section 207, Powers of the Board of County Commissioners and no changes to the requirements for amending the Orange County Comprehensive Plan.
- Take no further action on The Urban Neighborhood Focus Amendment as a charter amendment.
- Recommend that the CRC transmit a recommendation to the Mayor that she explore designating a staff member to serve as a Coordinator for Pine Hills, empowered to directly coordinate with county department heads on behalf of Pine Hills.

EXHIBIT A

From: Susan.McCune@ocfl.net
To: rj@rjmueller.net
Cc: Charter; Golgowski, Gregory F (BCC)
Subject: RE: Orange County CRC - 2016-01-12 Protection of the Rural Boundary Work Group Agenda
Date: Tuesday, January 12, 2016 6:38:27 PM

Good evening,

The list of criteria discussed at today's meeting came from the Orange County Comprehensive Plan as adopted from the Florida Statutes. The following is the link to the Comprehensive Plan http://www.orangecountyfl.net/Portals/0/resource%20library/planning%20-%20development/Comprehensive%20Plan%20GOPS%202030.pdf (see page FLU-8 through FLU 13).

The policies were mirror the statutory language found in F.S. 163.3177(6)(a)(9)(a) and (b) http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=0100-0199/0163/Sections/0163.3177.html

Policy FLU1.3.1B

In accordance with Florida Statutes 163.3177(6)(a)(9)(b), an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan shall be determined to discourage the proliferation of urban sprawl if it incorporates a development pattern or urban form that achieves four or more of the following:

1. Directs or locates economic growth and associated land development to geographic areas of the community in a manner that does not have an adverse impact on and protects natural resources and ecosystems;
2. Promotes the efficient and cost-effective provision or extension of public infrastructure and services;
3. Promotes walkable and connected communities and provides for compact development and a mix of uses at densities and intensities that will support a range of housing choices and a multimodal transportation system, including pedestrian, bicycle, and transit, if available;
4. Promotes conservation of water and energy;
5. Preserves agricultural areas and activities, including silvacultural, and dormant, unique, and prime farmlands and soils;
6. Preserves open space and natural lands and provides for public open space and recreation needs;
7. Creates a balance of land uses based upon demands of residential population for the nonresidential needs of an area;
8. Provides uses, densities, and intensities of use and urban form that would remediate an existing or planned development pattern in the vicinity that constitutes sprawl or if it provides for an innovative development pattern such as transit-oriented developments or new towns as defined in s. 163.3164.

~Susan

Susan McCune, AICP
Project Manager
Planning Division
Community, Environmental,
and Development Services
407.836.0952

EXHIBIT B

Date Presented	Presented by	Topic(s)
5/14/2015	Pete Clarke, District 3 Orange County Commissioner	Protection of rural enclaves rather than rural settlements
6/9/2015	Bertina Busch	Establish an Unincorporated Urban Census Designated Office of Administrative Coordination in Orange County for the need for redevelopment
6/9/2015	Kenneth Dwyer	Establish an Unincorporated Urban Census Designated Office of Administrative Coordination in Orange County for the need for redevelopment
7/9/2015	Bertina Busch	Establish an Unincorporated Urban Census Designated Office of Administrative Coordination in Orange County for the need for redevelopment
7/9/2015	Noel Busch	Establish an Unincorporated Urban Census Designated Office of Administrative Coordination in Orange County for the need for redevelopment
8/13/2015	Steve Micciche	Asked the CRC to hold the unincorporated areas of East Orange County as rural East of the Econ River and West of the Econ River can stay urban
8/13/2015	Jimmy Hester	Encourage the CRC to put on the ballot the protection of the East side of town at the rural boundary
10/8/2015	David Siegel	Asked the commission to impanel a committee to look into the conflict the community has with builders wanting to develop East of the Econ
10/8/2015	Thomas Glover	Asked for protection to the green space that the citizens are asking to preserve
11/12/15	Jennifer Rey	Does not want any more houses developed until the roads are improved
11/12/15	Richard Andrade	a) Entitlements were meant to be the exception of the rule, not the rule itself b) The 2013 Comprehensive Land Use Plan specifies rules and regulations that must be followed and met to develop land in Orange County c) It has its own internal processes on how the document could be modified. d) The BCC and the developers have not followed the rules in the Comprehensive Plan; they are using text amendments on the zoning to circumvent certain aspects of the Comprehensive Plan e) Giving the residents of Orange County the opportunity to vote on changing the standards by which the BCC operate under to allow major zoning changes is a much more fare procedure to slow down the pace in which new zoning changes are considered and ensures that the interest of all parties are judicially considered f) Strongly believes that the BCC meeting should have a unanimous vote to change property zoning

11/12/15	David Siegel	a) Sarasota County set up in there Charter that changes to the Comprehensive Plan or anything that increases the intensity or density has to have a unanimous vote of the BCC b) Impanel a new committee to look into the issue
11/12/15	Emily Bonilla	a) Developers are marketing their developments to the BCC as needed because we have increasing job demands and need homes to house the increase in population. However, the data says the opposite b) Give the people the say-so in what happens in regards to development. The people really do know what is best for them because they live it every day
11/12/15	Tom Glover	Asked the commission if there are any motions that can be taken to protect the rural areas, the green space that is within it, and all the assets that add to the diverse value to the county
11/12/15	Tom Narvt	a) Requested that the commission consider SaveOrangeCounty.org suggested additions to the Orange County Charter to help protect the rural services boundary as well as the Comprehensive Plan b) Put together a sub- committee to look at the amendments similar to what has been established in Sarasota and Seminole County that will help protect the people and the Comprehensive Plan
11/12/15	Elizabeth Hester	Submitted density information for review and consideration to work in favor of putting the SaveOrangeCounty.org additions to the Orange County Charter to help protect the rural services boundary and Comprehensive Plan
11/12/15	William Lutz	Gathered 7,531 petition that say no to more urban sprawl in the rural service area and to protest efforts to rezone the rural lands to accommodate two mega Lake Pickett housing developments
11/12/15	Ariel Horner	a) East Orange County is in crisis of potentially having its environmental health compromised b) There are a lot of animals and waterways that need our protection if we cross the rural service area
11/12/15	John Lina	a) Submitted a letter from the 1000 friends of Florida b) Is interested in an amendment that says do not cross the urban service boundary with developments c) Looking for a unanimous or super majority vote from the BCC
11/12/15	Jimmy Hester	a) Need a voice b) Rural businesses have set-up shop East of the Econ making a living off of the lifestyle c) As a stakeholder who chose to move in a certain area with certain zoning, I plead for help to stop urban sprawl across the rural boundary East of the Econ with a unanimous vote.
11/12/15	Umut Kocaman	Asked for help because the county is going against the Comprehensive Plan and policies
11/12/15	Kelly Semrad	a) A majority of people in the local area is opposed to the development b) Concerned with the long-term vs. short-term economic gains from the developments c) Asked for some help

11/12/15	Marie Martinez	a) Asked to support the individuals who signed the petition b) Significant impact on traffic c) The people do not have much of a voice
11/12/15	Maria Bolton-Joubert	a) Lake Pickett North property is worthy of preservation and land acquisition b) Both north and south are part of a wildlife corridor that is of high conservation value c) Requested a meeting one weekend or evening a month for issues that impact people so they can have an opportunity to speak during public comment
11/12/15	Daisy Morales	Concerned with the quality of the Econ river and how the North and South Lake Pickett development may impact the river with the run of contamination.
11/12/15	John Pardo	Start listening to the public because they are the ones that can elect you back into office
11/12/15	Trini Quiroz	a) Understands the traffic issue b) The people have to be listened to
11/12/15	Bobby Beagles	a) The agreement with the BCC was that the sewer and water lines would never be increased b) There is not a development out there that is operating off of what was originally approved c) Asked for a unanimous vote from the BCC or 65% resident vote from the residents that live in the area to accept the conditions of the new developments
12/01/2015	Lavon Williams	Presented on the County's plans to revitalize and redevelop urban neighborhoods
12/01/2015	Michele Owens	Presented on the Pine Hills Neighborhood Improvement District
12/01/2015	David Siegel	a) Concerned that the whole county is going to end up being an urban sprawl b) Modeling Sarasota's higher threshold marginalizes some of the developers' influences
12/01/2015	Steve Healy	Thoroughly vet the issue to ensure there are no loopholes in the future
12/01/2015	Bobby Beagles	a) Is not against development and growth however, he is bothered when a vote comes up 100 to 1 against a project and the project still gets approved b) Is there is anything that can be done to help clean up the Pine Hills neighborhood, there are good people there
12/01/2015	Bill Lutz	Is really encouraged that the work group is looking into the matter especially when the feeling is that the citizens do not have a chance when developers and some politicians are involved

12/01/2015	Emily Bonilla	a) There are fewer jobs in the area than in 2010, so population growth does not always lead to economic growth b) Increasing the population in the area will make it harder for the citizens who live in the area to find work c) Suggested not combining the two topic - The Urban Neighborhood Focus Amendment and the Protection of the Rural Boundary
12/01/2015	Umut Kocaman	There are inconsistencies within the County's meeting reports
12/01/2015	John Lina	Keep the loopholes in mind when making a decision
12/01/2015	Susan McCune	a) As the Project Manager with the Planning Division, she would be happy to prepare a presentation for the work group to present at a future meeting b) The state requires the Planning Division to evaluate and apprise the Comprehension Plan and one of the things they are contemplating is how to divide the county into smaller sections for Planning which speaks to the problem of coordination of information in the Pine Hills area
12/01/2015	Ken Dwyer	Requested that the Mayor and County Administration designate a person as a coordinator for the census-designated places like Pine Hills
12/01/2015	Tim Haberkamp	The Pine Hills community council would like a person to be appointed as a coordinator with knowledge of all of the work being done in the neighborhood instead of having to call different departments to get answers
12/10/15	R. J. Muller	Requesting an unanimous vote of the BCC on any zoning changes East of the Econ
12/10/15	David Siegel	The infrastructure tax could be looked into again and perhaps modified so that 50% can be used to purchase green space and the other percentage for roads and infrastructure
12/10/15	Noel Bush	Requested interdepartmental coordination and interjurisdictional collaboration in a manner that effectively represents the Pine Hills community
01/12/2016	Greg Golgowski	Presented an overview of the Orange County Comprehensive Policy Plan (CPP) specifically how a CPP amendment is processed through the County and State
01/12/2016	Susan McCune	
01/12/2016	Dwight Saathoff	a) The proposal is extremely undemocratic and un-American b) If each Commissioner has veto power, it encourages political patronage, political shenanigans, or corruption

01/12/2016	Emily Bonilla	a) There has been a change when someone goes to amend the comprehensive plan that is staff sponsored. She stated it can now be privately sponsored without staff sponsorship b) If a project is good, why wouldn't all of the Commissioners vote on it c) Having a unanimous vote will not stop good projects d) It will be difficult to find any hard data on the impacts of projects going forward because of the recession
01/12/2016	Maria Martinez	a) The public meetings were not neutral meetings. There were many people there in opposition of the projects presented b) The amount of time a citizen is allotted to present their concerns is not enough while developers are given unlimited rebuttal time during public meetings
01/12/2016	Umut Kocaman	Major decisions are made using unanimous vote so a unanimous vote is not a dictatorship
01/12/2016	David Siegel	Recommended calling Commissioner Aides to help gather information on the impacts
01/12/2016	Bob [Inaudible]	a) Agrees with Mr. Saathoff's comments b) Now is the time for growth
01/12/2016	R.J. Muller	Agrees with the comment that the proposal should not be for the entire county but instead just between the St. John's and the Econ because 75% of the rural land is in that area
01/12/2016	Bill Lutz	He has 8,431 petitions seeking rural protection
01/12/2016	Julie Kendrick [Phonetic]	a) The current proposal is more restrictive than what is in the Sarasota Charter b) A project specific issue that impacts the entire county is not appropriate for a Charter amendment
01/12/2016	Dan O'Keefe	a) The proposed amendment is an extreme proposal b) It is anti-growth, and tramples on a lot of the private property rights for the property owners that do own property outside of the Urban Service Area c) Urged the members not to support the proposal
01/12/2016	Kathy Hattaway [Phonetic]	One of the things the work group has not discussed if the proposal is passed is the unintended consequences
01/12/2016	Kathy Glover	Asked if the original property owners are land owners or homesteaders
01/14/16	Ken Dwyer	Presented submitted information to the CRC asking for support in providing the Pine Hills area with a coordinator

01/14/16	Kelly Semrad	a) Concerned with a possible conflict of interest based on a developer's comment made during a work group meeting on requiring a unanimous vote b) Concerned with the (8) eight principle indicators of urban sprawl that the state recommends and only having to achieve four (4) out of the eight (8). The minimum may not be the best guidelines
01/14/16	Tom Glover	Thanked the commission for their efforts
01/14/16	Emily Bonilla	a) Proposed that a new charter ballot initiative be reviewed by the committee to add to the County Charter ordinances that in order to prevent urban sprawl all of the state's eight (8) principles to prevent urban sprawl must be met b) Proposed that a new charter ballot initiative to be reviewed that will create stricter conflict of interest in reporting policies of the elected officials
02/09/2016	Katie Smith	Presented on the data compiled concerning the Board of County Commissioners voting on various CPP amendments from 2012 – 2015
02/09/2016	Ronald Brooke	Protect the land - there are developable areas within the boundaries for development which have been identified, don't destroy the rest of the land
02/09/2016	Dwight Saathoff	a) There is no unique resource, landmark creating compelling interest, or an area of critical state concern b) Restricting future growth in East Orange only means that all future Orange County growth will be disproportionally consolidated in other areas
02/09/2016	William Lutz	a) The records show that unanimous decisions are common by the BCC on these types of developer proposals b) Only the most sensitive and disputed rezoning issues tend to not have a unanimous decision
02/09/2016	Bob Tearadin [Phonetic]	Orange County should control government by majority rules, this is the democratic way
02/09/2016	Vivian Monaco	a) A charter amendment like this will make it more difficult to develop property in Orange County; which will in turn, make lots more expensive for home builders b) The home builders will go outside of the county to surrounding areas to buy lots to develop c) This will result in the outline counties having the more affordable homes for the people who work in Orange County d) It will be more difficult for property owners to develop their property

02/09/2016	Julie Kendrick [Phonetic]	a) The data does not show all the circumstances that go into the fact that a lot of the votes are unanimous or that projects go away before they make it to a vote b) If this is a project specific issue, she would respectfully submit that the charter is not an appropriate place to address a project specific issue
02/09/2016	David Axel	a) This proposal would restrict his property (forty acres at a traffic light) to one house and four cows. This is not fair or reasonable b) Requiring unanimous approval is not mora c) It is anti-private property rights; it seeks to enforce the status quo by imposing the will of the minority on other property owners without paying for their land
02/09/2016	Randy Fitzgerald	a) The implications of this for Orange County can be staggering b) Making the criteria to move an urban boundary to the point where it is almost prohibited is sending the wrong message to the developers and the investment community
02/09/2016	Cathy Hathaway[Phonetic]	a) The proposal is another no growth attempt cloaked in a rural protection package b) No growth policies have been shown time and time again to fail, they are not sustainable c) Request that the member reject the proposal
02/09/2016	Wayne Rich	a) The regional growth principle indicates how this region should grow b) This policy would fort those efforts in a major capacity and would be bad policy
02/09/2016	R. J. Mueller	a) They are not trying to stop people from developing land b) A unanimous vote from the BCC is being asked and based on the stats that were handed out; of the 230 votes only 10 were not unanimous
02/09/2016	Larry Simmons	a) Landowners have the right to develop their land in accordance with proper planning b) The issue is when we deviate from what is established c) There is a process within the procedures of Orange County to move the urban service boundary that has not been done

02/09/2016	Maria Martinez	In the early 90's when the Comprehensive Plan was first to be established across the state, the citizens and the BCC discussed the possibility of the entitlements. The agreement with residents was that just that area would be developed and services would be brought to the area with the agreement that if these areas were developed and if the residents agreed to these kinds of densities (these entitlements) then the rest of the area would not be developed. Now these entitlements are being used as justifications as to why it should be built further
02/09/2016	David Siegel	A standard was put in place and if you really need to go and violate or change those standards, you should have a really compelling reason.
02/09/2016	Emily Bonilla	Requested to add the following policies to the amendment: o Request to go back to the old determinations of urban sprawl o Request that all eight (8) determinations be followed instead of only four (4) o Request to include that landowners that want to do some rezoning or development on their property first offer their land to the county for sale
02/09/2016	Ken Dwyer	a) The CRC did not know they had to vote on the work group's recommendation to ask the Mayor to hire a person to coordinate the activities in Pine Hills b) Trying to get this work group to make sure it supplements its request to the CRC to get a coordinator for Pine Hills and some of the other areas
02/09/2016	Umut Kocaman	If the rezoning of a rural area is to the benefit of the county then all the Commissioners will agree and vote yes. Unanimous voting will not hurt anything
02/09/2016	Kelly Semrad	a) Reminded the members that the purpose of the work group is to determine whether or not a unanimous vote will hold merit for the rezoning of rural land to urban density b) Give it to the right of the people to have the opportunity to vote on this issue

02/09/2016	Dr. [Inaudible]	a) Supports growth, change, and development however; does not support it when it is at the expense of a very major stakeholder which is the residents b) One of the very critical principles of sustainable development is that you get all-inclusive stakeholder involvement and collaboration c) It is very clear that in this case, this principle is broken d) The residents of this area should be heard and a unanimous vote is absolutely necessary for the greater good and the well-being of the society
02/09/2016	Dan O'Keefe	a) Concerned that the amendment is driven on a project specific motivation and not sure that the Charter should address such an amendment b) Concerned with allowing one Commissioner to veto the determination of six other Commissioners c) The proposal is anti-growth, anti-property rights, anti-economic development, and asked the work group not to support the proposal
02/09/2016	Jimmy Hester	a) The need for a stronger Charter in East Orlando, East of the Econ b) Concerned with wildlife, rural businesses, and dangerous traffic situations c) Supports a stronger Charter like the model of Sarasota which requires a unanimous vote by the BCC but still gives the landowner the right to develop their property
02/09/2016	John Lina	a) Requested that the work group please take the matter into consideration b) It has the merit and deserves to be voted on by the citizens, not driven by the special interest
02/11/16	RJ Mueller	a) Disappointed in the work group meeting, how can the information and the will of the people be dismissed so easily b) Requested the work group be reopened and all options be reconsidered
02/11/16	Jimmy Hester	a) The result of the work group are sending shockwaves across rural businesses owners b) The will of the people are being ignored
02/11/16	David Bottomley [Phonetic]	The commission should take a look at preserving the urban boundaries, please consider what the future is going to be

02/11/16	Trini Quiroz Chair, The Black-Latino & P.R. Alliance for Justice	The people need a champion to represent the good of the people
02/11/16	Maria Bolton-Joubert	a) This item needs to be brought up for future and further discussion, needs more public attention, a better meeting time slot b) Wants more public access and transparency
02/11/16	Thomas Glover	Thanked the commission and citizens for protecting our rural areas
02/11/16	Emily Bonilla	a) The community is fighting to preserve their right to a rural lifestyle b) They invested in communities in an area that was promised to remain rural c) Asked that the conversation continue on the protection of the rural boundary with different members
02/11/16	Kelly Semrad	a) The work group's decision lacked reliability based on the following assumptions: • The proposal was not intended or stated to be project specific • It was stated that if a unanimous vote passed it would stagnate growth rates; however, data collected expressed the opposite • It is not the job of the CRC work group members to determine the actual items that go onto ballot, rather it is the job of the committee to determine what issues holds merit • When asked if the members would consider a less stringent approach of the proposal, the committee declined
02/11/16	Umut Kocaman	The way the work group handled the rural issue really discourages him to be involved, feels like they are not being heard
02/11/16	Tom Narvt	Pleaded that the CRC take the issue back to the committee, refine it, state that it does have merit, and put it on the ballot
02/11/16	David Siegel	Asked to reestablish the work group with different people or move to the CRC Issues committee for reconsideration
02/11/16	Cheryl Coats	b) Our representatives need to be listening to their constituents and not catering to the developers and lawyers c) Save the last rural development, don't destroy it
02/11/16	Ariel Horner	Our water resources will be disturbed if you choose not to protect the rural boundary

EXHIBIT C

2012 CPP Amendments Voting Status

	Unanimous	6-1	5-2	4-3	Motion Failed	Commissioner Absent / Abstain from Vote
TRANSMITTAL						
21-Feb-2012						
2012-1-A-1-1	1					
2012-1-A-3-1		1				Commissioner Brummer voted No
2012-1-A-4-1	1					
2012-1-A-5-1	1					
2012-1-B-FLUE-1	1					
2012-1-B-FLUE-2	1					
2012-1-B-FLUE-4	1					
2012-1-B-FLUE-5	1					
2012-1-B-FLUE-6	1					Commissioner Russell - Absent
2012-1-B-CP-1	1					Commissioner Russell - Absent
TOTALS	**8**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
ADOPTION						
19-Jun-2012						
2012-1-A-1-1	1					Commissioners Boyd & Martinez - Absent
2012-1-A-5-1	1					Commissioners Boyd & Martinez - Absent
2012-1-A-3-1	1					County Mayor Jacobs- Absent
2012-1-A-4-1	1					
2012-1-B-FLUE-1	1					Commissioner Martinez - Absent
2012-1-B-FLUE-2	1					Commissioner Martinez - Absent
2012-1-B-FLUE-4	1					
2012-1-B-FLUE-5	1					
2012-1-B-FLUE-6	1					
2012-1-B-CP-1	1					
2012-1-S-1-2	1					
2012-1-S-1-3	1					
2012-1-S-3-1	1					
2012-1-S-3-2	1					

2012-1-S-4-1	1					
2012-1-S-4-2	1					
2012-1-S-4-3	1					
2012-1-S-4-4	1					Commissioner Martinez & Russell - Absent
2012-1-S-5-1	1					Commissioner Martinez
2012-1-S-2-1	1					Commissioner Martinez
TOTALS	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**
TRANSMITTAL						
31-Jul-2012						
2012-2-A-5-1	1					
2012-2-B-FLUM-1	1					County Mayor Jacobs & Commissioner Edwards - Absent
2012-2-B-FLUE-1	1					County Mayor Jacobs & Commissioner Edwards - Absent
2012-2-B-FLUE-2	1					County Mayor Jacobs - Absent
2012-2-B-FLUE-3	1					County Mayor Jacobs - Absent
2012-2-B-NE-1	1					County Mayor Jacobs - Absent
2012-2-B-CP-1	1					County Mayor Jacobs - Absent
2012-2-B-CP-2	1					County Mayor Jacobs - Absent
2012-2-B-CP-3	1					County Mayor Jacobs - Absent
2012-2-B-TRAN-1	1					County Mayor Jacobs - Absent
2012-2-B-TRAN-2	1					
TOTALS	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**
ADOPTION						
13-Nov-2012						
2012-2-A-5-1	1					
2012-2-B-FLUM-1	1					
2012-2-B-FLUE-1	1					
2012-2-B-FLUE-2	1					
2012-2-B-FLUE-3	1					
2012-2-B-NE-1	1					
2012-2-B-CP-1	1					
2012-2-B-CP-2	1					
2012-2-B-CP-3	1					
2012-2-B-TRAN-2	1					

2012-2-S-4-1	1					
2012-2-S-5-1	1					
2012-2-S-6-1	1					
2012-2-S-1-2	1					Commissioner Martinez - Absent
2012-2-S-1-4	1					
TOTALS	**15**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**

2013 CPP Amendments Voting Status

	Unanimous	6-1	5-2	4-3	Motion Failed	Commissioner Absent / Abstain from Vote
TRANSMITTAL						
29-Jan-2013						
2013-1-A-1-1	1					Mayor/Thompson Absent
2013-1-A-4-1	1					Thompson Absent
2013-1-A-5-1						
2013-1 -B-FLUM-1	1					Thompson Absent
2013-1-B-FLUM-2	1					Thompson Absent
2013-1-B-FLUE-1	1					Thompson Absent
2013-1-B-FLUE-2	1					Thompson Absent
2013-1-B-FLUE-3	1					Thompson Absent
2013-1-B-FLUE-4	1					Thompson Absent
2013-1-B-CP-1	1					Thompson Absent
TOTALS	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
TRANSMITTAL						
23-Mar-2013						
2013-1-C-TRAN-1	1					Edwards & Moore Russell Absent
TOTALS	**1**					
TRANSMITTAL						
6-Aug-2013						
2013-2-A-1-1	1					
2013-2-A-1-2	1					
2013-2-A-1-3	1					
2013-2-A-1-4	1					
2013-2-A-3-1	1					
2013-2-A-4-1	1					Mayor Absent
2013-2-A-4-2	1					Mayor Absent

2013-2 -B-FLUE-1	1					Mayor Absent
2013-2 -B-FLUE-2	1					Mayor Absent
2013-2 -B-FLUE-3	1					Mayor/Thompson Absent
2013-2 -B-CP-1	1					Mayor/Thompson Absent
TOTALS	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
ADOPTION						
26-Mar-2013						
2013-1-C-TRAN-2	1					Commissioners Edwards & Moore Russell Absent
TOTALS	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
ADOPTION						
14-May-2013						
2013-1-A-1-1	1					
2013-1-A-4-1	1					
2013-1-B-FLUM-1	1					
2013-1-B-FLUM-2	1					
2013-1-B-FLUE-1	1					
2013-1-B-FLUE-2	1					
2013-1-B-FLUE-3	1					
2013-1-B-FLUE-4					1	Boyd, Brummer, Edwards & Moore Russell Voted No
2013-1-B-CP-1	1					
2013-1-S-5-1		1				Thompson Voted No
2013-1-S-2-1	1					
2013-1-S-2-2	1					
2013-1-S-3-1	1					
TOTALS	**11**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	
ADOPTION						
24-Sep-2013						
2013-1-C-TRAN-1		1				Edwards Voted No
TOTALS	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
ADOPTION						

19-Nov-2013						
2013-2-A-1-2	1					
2013-2-A-3-1	1					
2013-2-A-4-1	1					
2013-2-A-4-2	1					
2013-2-B-FLUE-3	1					
2013-2-B-CP-1	1					
2013-2-A-1-1	1					
2013-2-A-1-3	1					
2013-2-B-FLUE-1	1					
2013-1-B-FLUE-2	1					
2013-2-S-3-1	1					
2013-2-S-5-1	1					
2013-2-S-1-1			1			Brummer & Clarke Voted No
2013-2-S-4-1	1					
2013-2-S-FLUE-1	1					
TOTALS	**14**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	

2014 CPP Amendments Voting Status

	Unanimous	6-1	5-2	4-3	Motion Failed	Commissioner Absent / Abstain from Vote
TRANSMITTAL						
28-Jan-2014						
2014-1-A-4-2		1				Moore Russell Voted No
2014-1-A-1-2	1					Mayor Absent Edwards/Conflict
2014-1-A-1-3	1					Mayor Absent
2014-1-A-4-1	1					
2014-1-P-FLUE-1	1					
2014-1-A-1-1	1					
2014-1-B-FLUM-1	1					
2014-1-B-FLUE-1	1					
2014-1-B-FLUE-2	1					
2014-1-B-FLUE-3	1					
2014-1-B-FLUE-4	1					
2014-1-B-CP-1	1					
TOTALS	**11**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
ADOPTION						
3-Jun-2014						
2014-1-B-FLUM-1	1					
2014-1-B-FLUE-3	1					
2014-1-B-FLUE-4	1					
2014-1-B-CP-1	1					
2014-1-P-FLUE-1	1					Boyd Abstained
2014-1-A-1-1	1					Boyd Abstained
2014-1-A-1-2	1					Mayor/Edwards Absent
2014-1-A-4-1	1					Mayor Absent
2014-1-B-FLUE-1	1					Mayor Absent

2014-1-B-FLUE-2	1					Mayor/Thompson Absent
2014-1-S-2-1	1					Mayor Absent
2014-1-S-3-1	1					
2014-1-S-3-2	1					
2014-1-S-3-3	1					
2014-1-S-4-1	1					
2014-1-S-6-1	1					
2014-1-S-6-2	1					
2014-1-S-FLUM-1	1					
2014-1-S-FLUE-1	1					Moore Russell Absent
TOTALS	**19**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
ADOPTION						
8-Jul-2014						
2014-1-S-1-1	1					
2014-1-S-1-3	1					
TOTALS	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
TRANSMITTAL						
5-Aug-2014						
2014-2-A-1-1	1					
2014-2-A-1-2	1					
2014-2-A-4-1	1					
2014-2-A-4-3	1					
2014-2-A-5-1	1					
2014-2-B-FLUE-1	1					
2014-2-B-CP-1	1					
2014-2-B-CP-2	1					
2014-2-B-CP-3	1					
2014-2-C-CP-1	1					
2014-2-A-4-4		1				Brummer Voted No
2014-2-B-FLUE-2	1					
TOTALS	**11**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
ADOPTION						

16-Dec-2014						
2014-2-A-4-3	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-B-CP-1	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-B-CP-2	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-B-CP-3	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-A-1-1	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-A-1-2	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-A-4-1	1					Thompson/Edwards Absent
2014-2-B-FLUE-1	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-B-FLUE-2	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-S-2-1	1					Mayor/Thompson Absent
2014-2-S-4-1	1					Mayor/Thompson Absent
2014-2-S-5-3	1					Mayor/Thompson Absent
2014-2-S-5-2	1					Thompson Absent
2014-2-S-FLUE-1	1					Thompson Absent
TOTALS	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	

2015 CPP Amendments Voting Status

	Unanimous	6-1	5-2	4-3	Motion Failed	Commissioner Absent / Abstain from Vote
TRANSMITTAL						
27-Jan-2015						
2015-1-A-1-2	1					
2015-1-A-1-3	1					
2015-1-A-1-5	1					
2015-1-A-3-1	1					
2015-1-A-3-2	1					
2015-1-A-4-1	1					
2015-1-A-4-2	1					Edwards Abstained
2015-1-B-FLUE-4	1					
2015-1-A-1-1	1					
2015-1-B-FLUE-1	1					
2015-1-B-FLUE-2	1					
2015-1-B-FLUE-3	1					
2015-1-B-TRAN-1	1					
TOTALS	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
ADOPTION						
27-Jan-2015						
2014-2-A-5-1	1					
2014-2-S-5-1	1					
2014-2-S-FLUE-1	1					Thompson Absent
TOTALS	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
ADOPTION						
16-Jun-2015						
2015-1-A-3-2	1					
2015-1-B-TRAN-1	1					

2015-1-A-1-5	1					
2015-1-A-4-1	1					
2015-1-B-FLUE-1	1					
2015-1-S-2-2	1					
2015-1-S-2-3	1					
2015-1-S-3-1	1					
2015-1-S-3-2	1					
2015-1-S-6-1	1					
2015-1-S-2-1	1					
2015-1-S-4-1 (Denied)				1		Boyd, Clarke, Thompson & Siplin Voted to Deny
2015-1-S-5-2	1					Nelson Absent
2015-1-S-5-3	1					Nelson Absent
2015-1-S-FLUE-1	1					Nelson Absent
TOTALS	**14**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	

TRANSMITTAL						
28-Jul-2015						
2015-2-A-1-2	1					
2015-2-A-1-3	1					
2015-2-A-1-4	1					
2015-2-A-1-7	1					
2015-2-A-2-1				1		Mayor/Clarke & Thompson Voted No
2015-2-A-3-1	1					Edwards Absent
2015-2-P-FLUE-2	1					
2015-2-A-1-5	1					
2015-2-B-FLUM-1	1					
2015-2-B-FLUM-2	1					
2015-2-B-FLUE-1	1					
2015-2-B-FLUE-2	1					
2015-2-B-FLUE-3	1					
2015-2-B-TRAN-1	1					
2015-2-B-TRAN-2	1					
2015-2-A-5-1			1			Clarke & Thompson Voted No
2015-2-P-FLUE-1			1			Clarke & Thompson Voted No
TOTALS	**14**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**0**	

ADOPTION						
28-Jul-2015						
2015-1-A-1-2	1					Mayor Absent
2015-1-A-1-3	1					Mayor Absent
2015-1-B-FLUE-4	1					
2015-1-A-1-1	1					
2015-1-B-FLUE-3	1					
Ordinance 2015-1 Regular Cycle	1					
TOTALS	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	

ADOPTION						
17-Nov-2015						
2015-2-B-FLUE-3	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-B-FLUM-1	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-B-FLUM-2	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-B-TRAN-1	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-B-TRAN-2	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-A-1-7	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-A-1-2	1					Edwards, Siplin and Thompson Absent
2015-2-A-1-4	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-A-2-1	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-A-3-1	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-B-FLUE-1	1					Clarke and Siplin Absent
2015-2-B-FLUE-2	1					Edwards and Siplin Absent
2015-2-S-2-3	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-S-4-1	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-S-4-2	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-S-6-2	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-S-2-4	1					Siplin Absent
2015-2-S-FLUE-1	1					Siplin Absent
TOTALS	**18**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	